

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

LUIS JUAN VALENZUELA JR.,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2019-0195
Filed July 7, 2020

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
NOT FOR PUBLICATION
See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.19(e).

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. CR20183878001
The Honorable Teresa Godoy, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Vanessa C. Moss, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. VALENZUELA
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Eckerstrom authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Eppich and Judge Espinosa concurred.

E C K E R S T R O M, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Luis Valenzuela Jr. was convicted of armed robbery, disorderly conduct, and contributing to the delinquency of a minor. The trial court sentenced Valenzuela to enhanced, concurrent prison terms the longest of which was twelve years. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530 (App. 1999), stating she has reviewed the record and has found no “meritorious issue to raise on appeal.” Counsel has asked us to search the record for error. Valenzuela has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, see *State v. Delgado*, 232 Ariz. 182, ¶ 2 (App. 2013), the evidence was sufficient to support the jury’s finding of guilt, see A.R.S. §§ 13-1902(A), 13-1904(A), 13-2904(A)(6), 13-3612(1), 13-3613(A). The evidence presented at trial showed that Valenzuela, who had two historical prior felony convictions, threatened C.O., who was with nine-year-old I.V., with a knife, cut C.O.’s wrist, and took a bag containing bottles of alcohol from them, causing I.V. to thereafter suffer increased worry for C.O.’s safety. We further conclude the sentences imposed are within the statutory limits. See A.R.S. §§ 13-703(C), (J), 13-707(A)(1), 13-1904(B), 13-2904(B), 13-3613(A).

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Therefore, Valenzuela’s convictions and sentences are affirmed.